



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

§ 431. Why limit *malart* to the *Haguais*, when in a restricted meaning it is still French?

§ 433. *Femelle* used as an adjective should not be classed with *enceinte*, *scarlatine* as having no masculine. The gender of an adjective is not concerned with sex but only with grammatical agreement.

§ 446. A short vowel of the masculine form of the adjective is lengthened in the feminine not only before [z] but also when from free nasal it passes to checked nasal (*grand-grande*), and, according to the usual view, before [v] (*brève, vive*). Nyrop, § 447, 3, gives the vowel of *vive* as short, but in his *Manuel phonétique*, § 119, 4, he recognizes as long the vowels of *pensive*, *juive*, *saive*.

§ 465. The example from George Sand, where only two persons are compared and where the word-order is independent of the comparative form (cf. *il a la voix haute*), should not be cited as a persistence of the construction represented by *chargeant de mes débris les reliques plus chères*.

§ 476. Of the four examples given for Old-French of *plus* qualifying a substantive three are in the expression *plus prodome*, where a feeling of the original adjectival nature of *pro* probably remains. In the fourth, *Yvains est plus sire*, *plus* might be considered as joined to *est* rather than to *sire*. It is true there is no intrinsic difficulty in joining *plus* to substantives when, as in the case cited, they are without the article and have in reality an adjectival quality. Compare the passage from Ph. Mousket cited by Godefroy, *Comp.*, s. v. *seigneur*: *Ceste miracle [et] plus graignors Fist li sire des plus signors*.

§ 481, 2. By the side of *dui a dui* should be mentioned *dui et dui*.

§ 483, 1, and § 484. There is the omission, common to other treatises discussing *vingt* and *cent*, of an express statement about the existence of a full declension in Old-French embracing the singular as well as the plural. Compare: *Pur vint solz, ceo dist, le durra*, Marie, *Fables*, LXVII, 5; *Chevaliers meine plus de cent (: richement)*, Guigemar, 754; *Et bien xii vint chevaler . . . s'assisent*, *Perceval*, III, 15880; *L'an de grasse mil et III. C. (: sens)*, Jean de Condé, I, 296, 186; *Mielz en valt l'ors que ne funt cinc cens livres*, *Rol.* 516.

§ 490, *rem.* In speaking of the *Quinze-vingts* it might have been well to cite the early mention

of this order by Rustebuef (*Ordres de Paris*, II, 85-96).

§ 523, 4. 'Vulgaire' is a strong term to apply to the pronunciation *i vient* for *il vient*.

EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG.

Johns Hopkins University.

FRENCH DIALECTS.

Glossaire du parler de Pléchâtel (canton de Bain, Ille-et-Vilaine), par G. DOTTIN et J. LANGOUËT. Rennes-Paris, 1901. Pp. clx + 216.

The district studied in this *Glossaire* includes the departments of Ille-et-Vilaine, Loire-Inférieure, and those portions of Côtes-du-Nord and Morbihan lying east of a line drawn from Étables to the mouth of the Vilaine river, and bending slightly to the west in its course.

The *Glossaire*, as explained in the Préface, contains almost all the words used at Pléchâtel which do not coincide exactly with the corresponding French words. These include, in addition to ordinary words, the names of places, persons, and domestic animals. An extensive Introduction by M. Dottin, contains a general study of the grammar of the dialects of Haute-Bretagne and of the grammar of the dialect of Pléchâtel. Appended to the study of the linguistic material is a chapter, by M. Langouët, on "Usages et Traditions" of the commune dealing with such subjects, among others, as geography, marriage and religious customs and superstitions, games, weights, and measures. A song and two tales are given in phonetic transcription. An excellent and, apparently, complete Index of words and place-names is given. The whole is concluded by the addition of two maps, one of Haute-Bretagne, the other of the commune of Pléchâtel.

The first part of the introduction is devoted to a discussion of the phonology and morphology of the various dialects of Haute-Bretagne studied from a number of unedited manuscripts and from a few printed works noted in the bibliography.

The dialects of Haute-Bretagne are closely related to the neighboring ones of Bas-Maine. Their evolution singularly resembles that of French, the

influence of which they felt early, and from which they have borrowed terms and forms at different periods. If we except the southern part of Loire-Inférieure, where characteristics peculiar to the dialects of Poitou are found, the sub-dialects of Haute-Bretagne show real unity. The principal phonetic traits are common to a great number of dialects, and spread almost equally over all parts of the territory studied. Within each sub-dialect, however, an astonishing diversity is noticed, resulting from the evolution proper to Haute-Bretagne, from borrowings from French, and from the adjustment of these borrowings to the local phonetic system.

The interest in the sub-dialects themselves is rather limited; however, there are a few interesting evolutions, for example, the change of $\acute{e} < \text{ton}$. A into ei , the development of palatalization, of nasalization, and the formation of plurals. It would be interesting to know whether, in regions where the forms of place-names indicate former Breton settlements, the evolution of the dialect was not different from that in French territory, and whether the Breton phonetic system did not have some influence on the local Romance dialects. M. Dottin raises the question as to whether we know enough about the French language before the tenth century to be able to make a comparison between it and the Breton, and whether the mutual influences of these two dialects have not destroyed all vestiges of the original differences. But he proposes no solution.

In his treatment of the dialects of Haute-Bretagne M. Dottin's endeavor has been to point out the relations, whenever existing, between the dialects of Haute-Bretagne, on the one side, and the documents studied by Görlich¹ and the French pronunciation since the beginning of the sixteenth century, on the other.

The phonetic transcription (pp. x-xi) shows that the phonetic system of Pléchéat contains the oral and nasal vowels included in the French system. In addition to these are nasals corresponding to the French close e , o , eu and $\ddot{u}$. The open vowels are pronounced without muscular tension and with less convexity of the tongue than are the correspond-

ing French vowels. There are, however, a few instances of e and o corresponding exactly to the French open pronunciation of those vowels. It is noticeable that mute e plays a larger part than in French.

The following traits are of interest:

Palatals. Vowels under the influence of palatal consonants often become diphthongs which are better preserved than in French. $\text{Ai} < a + i$ remains in some instances as a diphthong. The diphthong ai is especially well retained in the termination *-aige* up to the thirteenth century, and is present to-day also in such words as *kanž* (*cage*), *saiž* (*sache*), etc. Ai also suffers reduction in the modern dialect to a , ei to e , oi to o . $\text{Aqua} > \text{eve}$, eeve , eïve in the charters, and eo in the modern dialect. Palatal plus A is generally the same as in French, but after the thirteenth century the tendency is to reduce ie to e . $\text{-ARIUM} > \text{iə}$, $\text{ARIAM} > \text{iər}$. The charters of the thirteenth century occasionally have *-er*, which is found to-day in the southern portion of Loire-Inférieure. -ICLUM , $\text{-ILUM} >$ not only el' , eï , but also al' , ai ; and ai , ei , œi , oi may be reduced to a , e , o . Ē plus a palatal has not the same development as in French. Charters of the thirteenth century have ei , ee , e . In the modern dialect the diphthong is reduced to e , e , e . Ō plus a palatal is diphthongized in the charters, the modern dialects have e , e , e . Ū plus a palatal becomes $\ddot{u}$ through the falling diphthong ui .

Nasals. Nasalization has left more traces in the dialects of Haute-Bretagne than in modern French, but the evolution of nasal vowels seems, as a rule, to have been the same. The final nasal $\text{an} > \text{ān'}$, āi , en' , ēi , or the vowel is denasalized; ən' , and ē are found in the thirteenth century, but ā is the usual form in the dialect. ĒN shows a similar development, but ĒN has almost always become ē . $\text{Ō} > \text{ā}$ only in the word *on* in Haute-Bretagne, but south of Loire-Inférieure ō always becomes ā . *In* is pronounced without nasalization of the vowel in some parts of the territory, elsewhere as in French. Checked AN , which was probably long, has broken into two parts, one or both of which may be nasalized āō , ēō , āā , ēu . Free vowels before a nasal have not lost the nasal quality as in French.

The second part deals exclusively with the

¹Die Nordwestlichen Dialekte der langue d'oïl. Bretagne, Anjou, Maine, Touraine. Fr. St. v, 25-428.

dialect of Pléchâtel, situated about twenty-five kilometers south of Rennes. The earliest mention of the place is made in 875, when the name appears as *plebis Castel*; in 1052 it is written *Ploucastellum*, and in 1086 *Ploicastel*. The dialect spoken at Pléchâtel is a good specimen of that of Haute-Bretagne. The phonology at first offers great confusion. French has not only enriched the vocabulary, but has influenced the forms of words greatly, and the laws of phonetics, which ceased to operate centuries ago in French, are operating now in the dialect through the influence of French. Analogy works with great precision, and there are few cases of false analogy. The tonic accent is not very different from French, but it is to be noticed that in polysyllables the accent has a tendency to shift to the penult.

An and *en* are generally distinct, mute *e* is the most frequently occurring vowel, and comes from the weakening of various vowels as, for example, of free *a*, *e*, or *o*, before a palatal, of *ei* (French), *ai* (French), all in tonic position, and from various vowels in atonic position. Parasitic *e* is common, but mute *e* falls when its fall would not leave three or more consonants in contact. *I* is found for initial *a*. *Ki* regularly takes the place of *k* before *i*, *e*, *æ*, *u*, and their nasals. The plural is formed by making the final vowel long, close or a diphthong, but many nouns have the same form for singular and plural. A few Breton place-names occur. The subjunctive is obsolescent, the present indicative taking the place of the present subjunctive, and the past definite of the imperfect subjunctive.

The subject-matter is printed clearly, and the arrangement is such as to make reference easy. It would have been well if the author had devoted a special paragraph to diphthongization instead of allowing such matter to remain scattered through the book. As one reads, the impression is received that the development and reduction of diphthongs proceed very indiscriminately. Syntax receives no attention. An interesting addition to the chapter "Usages et Traditions" would be a statement regarding the folk-lore; whether there is any popular literature, its nature, and by what means it is being preserved. Beginning on page xvii Thurot is mentioned several times without the title of his work being given. *U* (*ou*) and *ü*

are not distinguished in phonetic transcription (p. x, 4).

A. E. CURDY.

Yale University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

EXPURGATION FOR TEXT-BOOKS.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—Professor Fitz-Gerald, in the last number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, has taken advantage of the publication of an edition of Galdos' *Electra* to point out, though with extreme reserve, the dangers of expurgation. Most decidedly we treat the masterpieces too freely, and a word of protest from time to time may do some good.

Not to speak of the numerous cases when an annotator seems entirely unable to distinguish between passages which can be left out without considerably harming the original text, and others where it is utterly impossible without robbing a novel, a drama, or a poem, of its very sense, one is sure in taking up some text-book and comparing it with the original to make startling discoveries. Some teachers, and I am sorry to say, even some College professors, take really shocking liberties. To avoid the appearance of being personal, no examples need be given here; but what has been done, for instance, with Daudet, Hugo, or many others, is outrageous and well calculated to arouse the indignation of any one who has even a faint trace of a literary conscience.

Is it not time to form a league against this new sort of a *bande noire*, not less harmful than the one so vigorously stigmatized about a century ago by Nodier and by Victor Hugo? Or, at least, could we not lay down and try to enforce a few rules regarding a practice as criminal in the realm of letters, as theft or forgery is in social life?

I suggest the following:

1). Under no circumstances whatsoever should one alter an original text if there is no reason for it.

2). Under no circumstances whatsoever should one take the trouble to improve an original text. It seems only just that Hugo or Daudet, Goethe or Keller, Dante or D'Annunzio, Lope de Vega or Galdos, should carry the responsibility, if they